

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/706,004 | BILOTTI, ALFRED J. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Hargobind S Sawhney | 2875 | |

All Participants:

(1) Hargobind S Sawhney.

(2) Mr. Raymond Sun.

Date of Interview: 29 September 2004

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

12

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.


☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____



 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation Sheet:

On September 29, 2004, the examiner contacted the attorney, Mr. Raymond Sun, to indicate that the limitation "the hollow support", recited in line 2 of Claim 12, lacks antecedent basis. Further because of the limitation "hollow support", Claim 12 would receive double patenting rejection under 35 U.S.C. 10. In response, Mr. Sun authorized an examiner amendment requiring "the hollow support" be rephrased as --the support--. Copy of the telephone interview is attached herewith.